

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 11-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 and 21-43 are withdrawn from consideration and have been canceled. Claims 11 and 16 are independent and are amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Drawings and Specification

FIGS. 1-7F of the drawings in the present application are amended, as shown in the attached sheets, to be labeled "RELATED ART." Likewise, the specification is amended to refer to FIGS. 1-7F as "related art" instead of "conventional art." It is respectfully submitted that these amendments do not introduce new matter into the disclosure.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings in the present application comply with USPTO requirements. Accordingly, a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, Form PTO-948, indicating that the drawings have been approved by the Official Draftsperson, is respectfully requested with the next Official communication.

Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement, with a PTO-1449, was submitted on September 4, 2003 for the Examiner's consideration. Acknowledgement of the PTO 1449 is respectfully requested with the next Official communication.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0022634 to Chung et al. Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' disclosed related art in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0118322 to Murade. Claims 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' disclosed related art in view of Murade, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,157,426 to Gu. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of any of the rejections, but merely to expedite the prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 11 is amended to recite a combination of elements in an array substrate for a transfective liquid crystal display device, including "a reflective electrode on and directly contacting the first passivation layer, the reflective electrode being connected to the switching element and including a transmission hole."

Independent claim 16 is amended to recite a combination of steps in a manufacturing method of an array substrate for a transfective liquid crystal display device, including "forming a reflective electrode on and directly contacting the first passivation layer, the reflective electrode being connected to the switching element and including a transmission hole."

It is respectfully submitted that the combinations of elements and steps recited in claims 11 and 16 are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art of record, including Applicants' disclosed background art, Chung et al., Murade or Gu.

Chung et al. discloses a transfective liquid crystal display device including a gate electrode 52, a source electrode 62, a drain electrode 64, a semiconductor layer 82, a passivation film 84, an interlayer insulating film 86, a reflective electrode 68 and a pixel electrode 70, as shown in Figs. 5A to 5D. The pixel electrode 70 in Chung et al. is formed between the passivation film 84 and the interlayer insulating film 86. The drain electrode 64 and the reflective electrode 68 also contact the pixel electrode 70 in region A, as shown in FIG. 5D. The Office Action equates the passivation film 84 in Chung et al. with the claimed "first passivation layer" in the present invention. However, the pixel electrode 70 in Chung et al. does not directly contact the passivation film 84. Therefore, Chung et al. does not teach or suggest "a reflective electrode on and directly contacting the first passivation layer, the reflective electrode being

connected to the switching element and including a transmission hole,” as recited in claim 11. Similarly, Chung et al. does not teach or suggest “forming a reflective electrode on and directly contacting the first passivation layer, the reflective electrode being connected to the switching element and including a transmission hole,” as recited in claim 16.

The Office Action relies on FIGS. 4 and 5 of the instant application to reject claims 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Moreover, the Office Action states on page 7 that the subject matter of FIGS. 1-7E in the present application is considered an admission of prior art since these figures are labeled “CONVENTIONAL ART.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the claims based on FIGS. 4 and 5 is inappropriate because at the outset, no admission had been made by Applicants that FIGS. 1-7F qualify as statutory prior art usable in a rejection of the claim of the instant application. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants now clarify their position by re-labeling FIGS. 1-7F as “RELATED ART” and asserting that the features shown in FIGS. 1-7F are not prior art.

The Office Action concedes on page 4 that Applicants’ disclosed related art does not teach a first passivation layer being formed of an inorganic insulating material and a second passivation layer being formed of an organic insulating material. The Office Action relies on Murade for these teachings.

Murade discloses a liquid crystal device which includes a data line 3 formed between a second interlevel insulating film 13 and a third interlevel insulating film 15, and a pixel electrode 14 formed on the second interlevel insulating film 15. The Office Action equates the data line 3 in Murade with the claimed "reflective electrode" in the present invention. However, nowhere does Murade teach or suggest that the data line 3 is a reflective electrode. At least for the foregoing reasons, the combination of Applicants' disclosed related art and Murade does not teach or suggest the above-cited limitations of claims 11 and 16.

In rejecting claims 15 and 20, the Office Action relies on Gu for a teaching of an organic insulating material that is BCB or an acrylic resin. However, Gu does not teach or suggest the above-cited limitations of claims 11 and 16, and therefore fails to cure the deficiencies of Applicants' disclosed related art and Murade with respect to these claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied prior art of record, including Applicants' disclosed related art, Chung et al., Murade or Gu, fails to teach or suggest the combinations of elements set forth in independent claims 11 and 16. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102/103 are respectfully requested. It is believed that independent claims 11 and 16 are allowable. Since the remaining claims depend from these allowable independent claims, they are also

allowable for at least the above reasons, as well as for the additional limitations provided thereby. Thus, all claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Sam Bhattacharya (Reg. No. 48,107) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By James T. Eller, Jr. #41,458
James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538

SB
JTE/SB/ndb
3430-0174P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachments: Replacement Sheets